

REMARKS

In the Office Action the Examiner noted that claims 1-20 and 22 are pending in the application, and the Examiner rejected all claims. By this Amendment, claims 9-10, 14-15, and 17-20 have been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer, and claims 1, 3, 5-6, 11-13, 16, and 22 have been amended. Support for the claim amendments can be found throughout the specification and drawings, and particularly at least in Lines 9-17 on page of the specification. No new matter has been presented. Thus, claims 1-8, 11-13, 16, and 22 are pending in the application. The Examiner's rejections are traversed below, and reconsideration of all rejected claims is respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections Under 25 USC §112

In section 1 on page 2 of the Office Action the Examiner rejected claims 11 and 20 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as allegedly being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which the Applicant regards as the invention. The Examiner cited antecedent basis errors in each of these claims.

By this Amendment, claim 11 has been amended and no longer recites the antecedent basis errors cited by the Examiner, and claim 20 has been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer. Therefore, the Applicant respectfully requests the withdrawal of the Examiner's §112 rejection of claim 11.

Claim Rejections Under 35 USC §102

In item 3 on page 3 of the Office Action the Examiner rejected claim 22 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,405,175, issued to Ng (hereinafter referred to as "Ng"). The Applicant respectfully traverses the Examiner's rejection of this claim.

Claim 22 of the present application, as amended, recites a method including providing information to a first user responsive to a requested search corresponding to keywords, and assigning points to a second user who has selected and registered the keywords which were previously presented to the second user. The Applicant respectfully submits that Ng does not disclose at least these features of claim 22.

Ng discloses a process in which a user can help to build and maintain an online database by providing and/or updating product and price information. If the user provides price

information to the database, that user is provided a reward if another user finds the provided information after a search. The information providing user may also receive further reward if the other user uses that information (e.g., clicks on the link) to view the product at the supplier's web site (Column 8, Lines 33-49). The Examiner identified the reviewed products, i.e., the information supplied by the user, as the keywords of claim 22. However, the Applicant respectfully submits that it would be apparent to one skilled in the art that the keywords recited in claim 20 are keywords used in an information search, such as that conducted by an online search engine. In direct contrast to these search keywords, the product information viewed in Ng may merely be seen after a search is conducted. Also, it is respectfully submitted that no one skilled in the art would identify the products/services reviewed in Ng as "keywords".

Therefore, Ng does not disclose or suggest at least the features of claim 22 discussed above. Accordingly, Ng does not disclose every element of the Applicant's claim 22. In order for a reference to anticipate a claim, the reference must teach each and every element of the claim (MPEP §2131). Therefore, since Ng does not disclose the features recited in independent claim 22, as stated above, it is respectfully submitted that claim 22 patentably distinguishes over Ng, and withdrawal of the §102(e) rejection is earnestly and respectfully solicited.

Claim Rejections Under 35 USC §103

In item 5 on pages 3-9 of the Office Action the Examiner rejected claims 1-3, 8-9, 12-14, 17-18, and 20 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Ng in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0188532, issued to Rothstein (hereinafter referred to as "Rothstein"). By this Amendment, claims 9, 14, 17-18, and 20 have been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer. The Applicant respectfully traverses the Examiner's rejections of the remaining claims.

Claim 1 of the present application recites searching the user-by-keyword management table and the advertiser-by-keyword management table for keywords when a search using the keywords is requested by a second user through the network, and when the requested keywords have been registered both in the user-by-keyword management table and the advertiser-by-keyword management table, posting a result of the search along with an advertisement of the corresponding advertiser to the second user through the network. The Applicant respectfully submits that none of the cited references, taken either alone or together, disclose at least these features of claim 1.

The Examiner cited Column 8, Lines 33-49 of Ng as disclosing the features of claim 1 discussed above. However, as previously discussed in this Amendment, Ng merely allows a first user to submit product information, and then rewards that first user when a second user accesses that information. While the Examiner has characterized the user submitted product information as the keywords, the Applicant respectfully submits that anyone skilled in the art would plainly see that this submitted information is not tantamount to keywords used in a search. The result of the keyword search is provided along with an advertisement in claim 1 of the present application. This is in direct contrast to Ng, in which a searcher is merely presented with the information submitted by another user, and not an advertisement associated with that information. The searcher in Ng would have to then click on the user provided information in order to see an advertisement for that product. Further, it is respectfully submitted that it is apparent that the user submitted information in Ng is not tantamount to the search keywords recited in claim 1, because the searcher in Ng is able to find the user submitted information without using any of that user submitted information in the search. Also, on the other hand, the searcher in Ng could use the exact same information as submitted by the user and not be presented the user information, because the site housing the database information would then have to be chosen before the searcher sees any of the user submitted information. Therefore, the Applicant respectfully submits that Ng does not disclose or contemplate at least searching a user-by-keyword management table for keywords when a search using the keywords is requested, and posting a result of the search along with an advertisement of the corresponding advertiser.

Further, amended claim 1 recites presenting keywords to a first user through a network, and storing keywords selected from the presented keywords by the first user into a user-by-keyword management table relating to the first user. Even if the user submitted information is considered, *arguendo*, to be keywords, it is respectfully submitted that these features are not disclosed in any of the cited references.

In Ng, the user submitted information is all submitted by the users, and not selected from any presented keywords. The user in Ng submits "new information about a product Q, including the make, model, and price, and the URL of the supplying store's product web page" (Column 7, Lines 63-65). Thus, as all of this information is generated by the user, it is apparent that none of it is selected from any presented keywords, as recited in claim 1 of the present application.

In the Examiner's Response to Arguments, the Examiner alleged that this feature is disclosed in Ng, because a reviewer may be presented with the product/service review in order

to correct the review, and the selected review may be updated and attributed to the updating user. However, as already discussed in this Amendment, it would be readily apparent to one skilled in the art that the product/service reviews of Ng are not tantamount to search keywords.

In more detail, Ng discloses that a searchable database contains information submitted by rewarded users, that a plurality of records each contain information presented to a searcher when search terms input by the searcher match terms in the record, that a reward database contains account records for users including a reward count for each other, that the reward module increases a reward count for the rewarded user when the searcher views the information in the target record submitted by the rewarded user, and that rewards for submitting information depend on a number of times the information is viewed by others (Column 3, Lines 22-40).

Assuming, arguendo, that "the rewarded user" is "the first user", "the search term" is "the keyword", and "the searcher" is "the second user", no "advertiser" is included in Ng, and thus, Ng discloses a system in which the first user is rewarded when the second user views the information submitted by the first user, not an advertisement by the advertiser.

As seen in the Summary of the Invention, Ng fails to disclose features of posting result of the search along with an advertisement of corresponding advertiser to the second user, and giving points to the first user when the second user has referred to the advertisement.

Even further, the Examiner asserts that, with respect to claim 1, Ng discloses the feature of presenting keywords to a first user at Column 5, Line 21 through Column 6, Line 51, the feature of searching the user-by-keyword management table and advertiser-by-keyword management table, and when the requested keywords have been registered both in the user-by-keyword management table and the advertiser-by-keyword management table, posting a retrieved result of the keywords and advertisement to the second user, and giving points to the first user when the second user has referred to the advertisement at Column 8, Lines 33-49.

However, what Ng discloses at Column 5, Line 21 through Column 6, Line 51, and the related text, is that when a user corrects an error in a database, the user is rewarded. Ng discloses that when a user enters new product information or corrects existing information in product database 30, the account manager 42 rewards the user by increasing a reward count in reward database 44, and when other users access data in the database 30, or use that information to link to a supplier, the account manager 42 increases the reward count for the user that supplied or corrected the information used by other users (Column 5, Lines 58-65).

Also, Ng discloses, at Column 8, Lines 33-49 that when user B searches for a product and finds product Q that was entered into the database by user A, user A receives one additional point for the database "hit" on product Q.

Therefore, Ng does not have the user-by-keyword database and advertiser-by-keyword database, and, accordingly, Ng fails to disclose searching the user-by-keyword management table and advertiser-by-keyword management table when a search using the keywords is requested by a second user different from the first user, and, when the keywords have been registered both in the user-by-keyword management table and the advertiser-by-keyword management table, posting a result of the search along with advertisement to the second user.

Additionally, in Ng, a point is given to the first user not when the first user refers to the advertisement, but rather when a different user accesses information which the first user submitted or the different user used the information. Therefore, Ng also fails to disclose the feature of giving points to the first user when the second user has referred to the advertisement.

Therefore, Ng does not disclose, suggest, or even contemplate the features of claim 1 discussed above. Further as Rothstein apparently merely discloses the use of keyword advertising by associating an advertisement in a customer's electronic book with specific keywords chosen by the advertiser, Rothstein does not cure the deficiencies of Ng in regard to claim 1.

In more detail, the Examiner alleged that Rothstein discloses the use of keyword advertising by associating an ad with specific keywords chosen by the advertiser (Paragraphs [0025]-[0037]). However, as disclosed in Paragraphs [0031]-[0032] of Rothstein, the electronic ads can be sent with keywords associated with each ad to be used in determining the location within an electronic book of the ad, or the keywords can be used to select the book in which the ad will be inserted. As disclosed in Paragraph [0023], the keywords are specified by the advertisers. Therefore, neither of the cited references discloses or suggests the feature of presenting keywords to an advertiser through the network, and storing keywords selected by the advertiser into an advertiser-by-keyword management database. Therefore, there can be no proper §103 rejection of claim 1 from the combination of Ng and Rothstein.

Further, there is no motivation to combine Ng and Rothstein. In the Examiner's Response to Arguments, the Examiner alleged that it would be obvious to combine the references because Ng teaches a keyword selection process that includes targeted advertisement presentation while the Rothstein reference teaches the feature of advertisement being associated with keywords. However, as discussed at length in this Amendment, Ng

discloses no such keyword selection process. Further, Ng does not disclose any targeted advertisement presentation, because only the user provided URL is presented to a viewer, and thus there is no motivation to combine Ng with any advertisement association disclosed in Rothstein.

Therefore, the Applicants respectfully submit that neither of the cited references, either alone or in combination, disclose the above discussed features recited in claim 1 of the present application. Thus, the Applicants further respectfully submit that claim 1 patentably distinguishes over the cited references, and respectfully request the withdrawal of the Examiner's §103 rejection of the claim.

Claims 2-3 and 8 depend from claim 1 and include all of the features of that claim plus additional features which are not disclosed or suggested by the cited references. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that claims 2-3 and 8 also patentably distinguish over the cited references.

Claims 12-13 of the present application, as amended, also recite similar features to those recited in claim 1 and discussed above. Therefore, the Applicants respectfully submit that claims 12-13 also patentably distinguish over the cited references.

In item 6 on page 9 of the Office Action the Examiner rejected claims 4-7 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Ng and Rothstein as applied to claim 1, and further in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2001/0051911, issued to Marks et al. (hereinafter referred to as "Marks"). The Applicant respectfully traverses the Examiner's rejections of these claims.

As previously discussed in this Amendment, claim 1 of the present application patentably distinguishes over Ng and Rothstein. Further, as Marks apparently merely discloses associating an advertisement with specific keywords chosen by the advertiser in a search engine which charges different rates for each keyword, the Applicants respectfully submit that Marks does not cure the deficiencies of Ng and Rothstein in regard to claim 1. Therefore, as claims 4-7 depend from claim 1 and include all of the features of that claim plus additional features which are not disclosed or suggested by the cited references, it is respectfully submitted that claims 4-7 also patentably distinguish over the cited references.

In item 7 on pages 10-13 of the Office Action the Examiner rejected claims 10-11, 15-16, and 19-20 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Rothstein in view of Ng. By this Amendment, claims 10, 15, and 19-20 have been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer. The Applicant respectfully traverses the Examiner's rejections of the remaining claims.

Claims 11 and 16 of the present application, as amended, also recite similar features to those recited in claim 1 and discussed above. Therefore, as neither Ng nor Rothstein disclose, suggest, or even contemplate at least these features of these claims, the Applicants respectfully submit that claims 11 and 16 also patentably distinguish over the cited references.

Summary

In accordance with the foregoing, claims 9-10, 14-15, and 17-20 have been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer, and claims 1, 3, 5-6, 11-13, 16, and 22 have been amended. No new matter has been presented. Thus, claims 1-8, 11-13, 16, and 22 are pending and under consideration.

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is respectfully submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date:

06/26/07

By:

Thomas L. Jones
Thomas L. Jones
Registration No. 53,908

1201 New York Avenue, NW, 7th Floor
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501